Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/626,905	FRANZOSO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Audrey S. Pham	1642
All Participants:	Status of Application:	<u>FOAM</u>
(1) Audrey S. Pham.	(3)	
(2) Alice O. Martin.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 23 February 2006	Time: <u>11:15 AM</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ A Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	pplicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: NONE		
Claims discussed: Claims 1-2, 6		
Prior art documents discussed: NONE		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE G See Continuation Sheet	SENERAL NATURE OF WHAT V	VAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sepa directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sepa did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief sur 	 The examiner will provide a warrante irate record of the substance of 	the interview, since the interview
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (App	olicant/Applicant's Representative	e Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Upon review and reconsideration, an election is required to determine a starting point for the examination of the claims. Applicant is required to determine which one of the numerous targets listed on page 60 of the specification is the target, as claimed in Claim 1. On February 22, 2006, Ms Alice Martin is contacted and a request for an election is made. On February 23, 2006. Ms. Martin elected Gadd45 (of Claim 2) as the target of the invention. Ms. Martin also noted that Claim 8 was voluntarily withdrawn.